



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,231	04/04/2005	Young-Nam Yun	21C-0190	1269
23413 7590 04/21/2008 CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 20 Church Street 22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103				
EXAMINER				
DUONG, THOI V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2871				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/21/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/530,231

Applicant(s)

YUN, YOUNG-NAM

Examiner

Thoi V. Duong

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Amendment filed January 31, 2008.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 4 were amended. Currently, claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not describe the limitation "a semi-transmissive film disposed on the light generating section which transmit the first light and a first polarity of a second light which is incident to the semi-transmissive film from a direction substantially opposite to the first light, and which reflects only a second polarity of the second light, wherein the second polarity of the second light has a polarity substantially orthogonal to the polarity of the transmitted first polarity of the second light" recited in the claim. According to the specification in page 17, lines 6-12, "a part of light,

Art Unit: 2871

which is linearly polarized in the polarizing axis of the second polarizing plate 400, passes through the semi-transmissive film 600 and the remaining part of light is reflected from the semi-transmissive film 600." Thus, the specification does not describes that the semi-transmissive film passes the (second) light having a first polarity and reflects only the (second) light having a second polarity, wherein the second polarity is substantially orthogonal to the first polarity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 4, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kotchick et al. (Kotchick, US 6,975,455 B1).

Re claim 4, as shown in Fig. 4, Kotchick discloses a liquid crystal display device 400 comprising:

a light generating section 410/412 to generate first light 442;

a semi-transmissive film 408 disposed on the light generating section 410/412 which transmits the first light 439, 441, 443 and a portion (light 435) of a second light 434 which is incident to the semi-transmissive film 408 from a direction substantially opposite to the first light 442, and which reflects only a second portion (light 436) of the second light 434.

It is noted that the second light 434 has a first polarity (dot circle perpendicular to the drawing) and a second polarity (double arrow parallel to the drawing), wherein the second polarity is substantially orthogonal to the first polarity.

a polarizing member 406 (which includes a polarizing layer 902 and a light-diffusing layer 908 integrally formed with the polarizing layer as shown in Fig. 9), wherein the polarizing member is disposed adjacent to the semi-transmissive film 408 so as to generate a third and a fifth light by polarizing and diffusing the transmitted portion of the first light and to generate a fourth and a sixth light by polarizing and diffusing the reflected portion of the second light; and

a liquid crystal display panel 404 disposed on the polarizing member 406 to display an image by selectively receiving the fifth light or the sixth light.

It is inherent that the liquid crystal display panel includes a first substrate, a second substrate opposite to the first substrate and liquid crystal interposed between the first and second substrates.

Re claim 5, as shown in Fig. 10, Kotchick discloses that the light-diffusing layer 910 is positioned in opposition to the semi-transmissive film 904/906 so as to generate

the third light by diffusing the first light and to generate the fourth light by diffusing the second light, and

the polarizing layer 902 is disposed on the light-diffusing layer 910 so as to generate the fifth light by polarizing the third light and to generate the sixth light by polarizing the fourth light.

Re claim 9, as shown in Fig. 9, the polarizing layer 902 is positioned in opposition to the semi-transmissive film 904/906 so as to generate the third light by polarizing the first light and to generate the fourth light by polarizing the second light, and the light diffusing layer 908 is disposed on the polarizing layer 902 in opposition to the first substrate so as to generate the fifth light by diffusing the third light and to generate the sixth light by diffusing the fourth light.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotchick et al. (Kotchick, US 6,975,455 B1) in view of Epstein et al. (Epstein, US 6,801,276 B1).

Re claim 1, as shown in fig. 4, Kotchick discloses a liquid crystal display device 400 comprising:

a light generating section 410/412 to generate a first light 439, 441, 443;

a polarizing member 406 which transmits a first polarity of light 441, 443 (dot circle perpendicular to the drawing) and absorbs a second polarity of light 439 (double arrow parallel to the drawing) which is substantially orthogonal to the first polarity, wherein, as shown in Fig. 9, the polarizing member includes a polarizing layer 902 and a light-diffusing layer 908 integrally formed with the polarizing layer, and the polarizing member is disposed adjacent to the light generating section so as to generate a second and a third light by polarizing and diffusing the first light; and

a liquid crystal display panel 404 disposed on the polarizing member 406 to display an image by using the third light.

It is obvious that the liquid crystal display panel includes a first substrate, a second substrate opposite to the first substrate and liquid crystal interposed between the first and second substrates.

However, Kotchick does not disclose the light-diffusing layer having a concavo-convex surface.

As shown in Fig. 7, Epstein discloses a light-diffusing layer 708 equipped with a prismatic structure 712 having a concavo-convex surface (col. 13, lines 23-55).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display device of Kotchick with the teaching of Epstein by forming a light-diffusing layer having a concavo-convex surface in order to enhance the brightness of the display (col. 13, lines 52-55).

Re claim 2, as shown in Fig. 10, Kotchick discloses that the light diffusing layer 910 is positioned in opposition to the light generation section so as to generate the second light by diffusing the first light, and

the polarizing layer 902 is disposed on the light-diffusing layer 910 so as to generate the third light by polarizing the second light.

Re claim 3, as shown in Fig. 9, Kotchick discloses that the polarizing layer 902 is positioned in opposition to the light generating section so as to generate the second light by polarizing the first light, and

the light-diffusing layer 908 is disposed on the polarizing layer 902 so as to generate the third light by diffusing the second light.

9. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotchick et al. (Kotchick, US 6,975,455 B1) in view of Iijima (US 6,906,767 B1).

The liquid crystal display device of Kotchick includes all that is recited in claim 6 except for the light-diffusing layer having a haze value above 20%.

Iijima discloses a liquid crystal display device comprising a light-diffusing layer having a haze value above 20% (col. 9, lines 28-50 and col. 12, lines 26-31).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display device of Kotchick with the teaching of Iijima by employing a light-diffusing layer having a haze value above 20% in order to obtain a sufficiently diffused state, thereby reducing the parallax generation (col. 9, lines 54-57).

Re claim 10, as shown in Fig. 5 of Iijima, the second substrate 21 comprises a color filter 27 and a first electrode 24 and the first substrate 22 comprises a switching device and a second electrode 25 opposite to the first electrode 24 (col. 12, lines 1-15).

10. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotchick et al. (Kotchick, US 6,975,455 B1) in view of Kawamoto et al. (Kawamoto, US 6,809,782 B1).

As shown in Fig. 9, Kotchick discloses the light-diffusing layer 908 comprising coating material coated on one surface of the polarizing layer 902; however, Kotchick does not suggest scattering material mixed with the coating material as recited in claims 7 and 8.

As shown in Fig. 1, Kawamoto discloses a polarizing member comprising a polarizing layer 12 and a light-diffusing layer 11 coated on one surface of the polarizing layer 12, wherein the light-diffusing layer 11 comprising coating material and scattering material mixed with coating material and wherein the coating material comprises acrylic-based resin and scattering material includes silica particles (col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 37 and col. 4, lines 25-49).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the liquid crystal display device of Kotchick with the teaching of Kawamoto by forming a light-diffusing layer comprising coating material coated on one surface of the polarizing layer and scattering material mixed with coating material in order to inhibit coloration in viewing from a slantwise direction and attain bright displays (col. 1, lines 6-10).

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thoi V. Duong whose telephone number is (571) 272-2292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms, can be reached at (571) 272-1787.

/Thoi V. Duong/ - Primary Examiner

April 16, 2008

